

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on April 14, 2005, the examiner reviewed claims 1-25. Claims 1-5, 13-14, 23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (USPN 6,633,873, hereinafter “Nakamura”) in view of Bly et al. (U.S. Pub 2002/0077944, hereinafter “Bly). Claims 6-12, 15, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Bly and further in view of Harris (USPub 2002/0059204, hereinafter “Harris”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claim 12 was rejected as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Bly and further in view of Harris. Examiner avers that Harris teaches “the remote information source **comprises an electronic marketplace** See paragraph 0057, Harris.” Applicant respectfully points out that Harris teaches customizing a dictionary and providing rules for searches (see Harris, paragraph 0057).

In contrast, the present invention comprises a remote information source comprising an **electronic site** (an electronic marketplace) that facilitates transactions (see page 7, lines 19-23 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it provides a method and apparatus for transacting procurement operations with the electronic marketplace. There is nothing within the combined system of Nakamura, Bly, and Harris, either separately or in concert, which suggests a remote information source comprising an electronic site that facilitates transactions.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 to include the limitations of claim 12 to clarify that the present invention comprises a remote information source comprising an electronic site that facilitates transactions. These amendments find support on page 7,

lines 19-23 of the instant application. Claim 12 has been canceled without prejudice.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-11 and 13, which depend upon claim 1, claims 16-21, which depend upon claim 15, and claims 24-25, which depend upon claim 23, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 17 May 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665